

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,249	01/27/2004	Stephen McConnell Gates	YOR920010052US3 (16876Z)	4166
7:	590 09/29/2004		EXAMINER	
Robert M. Trepp IBM CORPORATION			FENTY, JESSE A	
	perty Law Dept.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 218			2815	
Yorktown Heig	hts, NY 10598		DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			- Wh
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	•
	10/766,249	GATES ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jesse A. Fenty	2815	
The MAILING DATE of this communicated for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	is
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum staturent of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum staturent or reply within the set or extended period for reply	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a lication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO II, by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rly (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commu BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>27 January 2004</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice	•	• •	rits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>56-72</u> is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>56-59 and 67-72</u> is/are reject 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>60-66</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	a)∏ accepted or b)∏ objected to	by the Examiner.	
 Applicant may not request that any objecti 	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to be	· ·	• • •	· ·
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internationa * See the attached detailed Office action	ocuments have been received. ocuments have been received in a the priority documents have been al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Sta	ge
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTAPER NO(s)/Mail Date 		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152 	2)

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 56 and 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apen et al. (US 2003/0017635 A1).

In re claims 56 and 69, Apen (Figs. 1-5) discloses an electronic structure comprising at least one SiCOH dielectric material (polycarbosilane; section [0093], lines 18-21), having a dielectric constant of less than 3.5 (section [0093], line 26). Apen does not expressly disclose empirical values for the electric field nor leakage current of the device. However, these parameters simply appear to be functions of the thickness of the SiCOH layer (Applicant's

Art Unit: 2815

Specification, pp. 17, lines 1-5). Since Apen discloses SiCOH and having the claimed permittivity, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to determine, without undue experimentation, an optimal thickness of the dielectric layer to achieve the given result.

In re claim 67, Apen discloses the device of claim 56, wherein said conductor is patterned.

In re claim 68, Apen discloses the device of claim 56, wherein said SiCOH dielectric material and said conductor are components of at least one device selected from the group consisting of an inductor and a capacitor (section [0086]).

Double Patenting

3. Claims 56-59 and 67-72 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of Gates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,737,727 B2). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because since the claims of the instant application only refer to a dielectric layer and a conductor, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use these component parts in a complete device, because the combination of a dielectric layer and a conductor does not equal a whole device.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 60-66 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

 The claims comprising the previous subject matter and at least a SiCOH layer including a graded composition of carbon content is neither anticipated nor obvious over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jesse A. Fenty whose telephone number is 571-272-1729. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4-9 1st Fri. Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 571-272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/766,249

Art Unit: 2815

Page 5

Examiner
Art Unit 2815